

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

VOL. XCIX

Pittsburgh, Pa., March, 1955

No. 2

WHY NOT DRINK SOCIALLY?

Editorial from The Lutheran Companion, January 12, 1955

Used by permission.

In the Mailbag of this week's issue of "The Lutheran Companion" we print a letter from a reader in Worcester, Mass., calling attention to our constant warfare on strong drink and demanding to know why he should "not take a drink in the company of friends." Our correspondent asks if it is not possible to sin against our bodies (God's temple) by indulging in too rich food as well as by cocktails, and he adds, "Why not a campaign against pecan pie, etc., alongside the campaign against highballs?"

It is true, as our Worcester friend writes, that Christ turned water into wine and that wine was probably used more widely than any other beverage in Jesus' time. It is likewise true that it would be difficult to find Scriptural proof that drinking is in itself a sin, except when it leads to excess and results in drunkenness. (Of drunkards it is plainly stated that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Cor. 6. 10.)

On the other hand, the Scriptures are full of warnings regarding the use of wine and strong drink. In the 10th chapter of Leviticus, Aaron and his sons were warned on pain of death not to drink wine or strong drink before going into the tabernacle, in order that they might discern between the holy and the common, the clean and the unclean, and that they might be able to teach the children of Israel the statutes of God. Likewise, we read in the 6th chapter of Numbers that when a Nazarite made his religious vows by which he separated himself for the service of God, he must also "separate himself from wine and strong drink."

In Proverb 20.1 we are told, "Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler; and

whosoever erreth thereby is not wise." And again in Proverbs 23. 19-21 we read: "Hear thou, my son, and be wise, and guide thy heart in the way. Be not among winebibbers, among gluttonous eaters of flesh: for the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty; and drowsiness will clothe a man in rags." And again we are warned in Proverbs 23, 31, 32: "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it sparkleth in the cup, when it goeth down smoothly: at the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."

When we come to the New Testament, we find that it is the Apostle Paul who deals most clearly with the problem of strong drink. While he insists that "the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit," and that no one has a right to judge his brother because of what he eats or drinks, he is equally emphatic that a Christian is responsible to God for the example he sets for others. Therefore, he makes it clear that the conscientious believer will willingly renounce something of his Christian liberty for the sake of a weaker brother. To the Christians at Rome he writes: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth." Romans 14. 21. Likewise to the Corinthian Christians: "If meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble." 1 Cor. 8. 13. And again, after warning the Corinthians that no drunkard "shall inherit the kingdom of God," Paul adds, "All things are lawful for me; but not all

(Continued on page 7)

The Decrease In Cigarette Sales In 1954 And The Reason For It

Concern over the relationship of cigarette smoking to lung cancer is reflected in the decrease in sales of five leading tobacco companies in 1954 from sales in 1953. The following figures come from the December 13th issue of Advertising Age, the top National Journal of Marketing and Advertising. Liggett & Myers, the makers of Chesterfields, show an estimated drop of \$11,500,000; P. Lorillard Co., makers of Old Golds, an estimated drop of \$18,900,000; The American Tobacco Company, makers of Lucky Strikes, an estimated drop of \$23,400,000; R. J. Reynolds, makers of Camels, an estimated drop of \$26,200,000 and Philip Morris & Company an estimated drop of \$74,900,000.

Due to lower excess profits taxes and to higher profit margins on king size and filter tip brands, the decrease in sales is not reflected in decreased earnings for these companies.

Commenting on the market for leading cigarette stocks, the Arnold Bernhard & Co., investment analyst, reporting on a recent study of tobacco companies securities, says:

"Investment in cigarette equities involves more risks than their high quality ranking and impressive past records might otherwise suggest. Smokers and investors will both continue to look anxiously for refutation of the charges concerning cigarettes and cancer, or for the elimination of the dangerous elements."

The report goes on to say, "Next year we foresee a return to the pattern of cigarette consumption in evidence over the past years *unless another mid-year report by the American Cancer Society substantiates the tentative findings of 1954.* (Italics ours).

The Tobacco Industries' Hope For a Solution

The tobacco industry hopes and expects that within the next four to six years, one or more of three possibilities will develop. "Charges that cigarette smoking causes cancer may be proven spurious, or effective filtration will be developed or the carcinogenic element in tobacco may be isolated and eliminated from cigarettes."

Whether any of these possibilities may be realized, however, is another question. So far, attempts at filtration have been ineffective. That the charge that cigarette smoking causes cancer may be proven spurious is most unlikely. Further research is more likely to add support to the charge. Fourteen different statistical studies already conducted in five different countries have all shown the same result, and not a single published study on the subject shows a lack of association between lung cancer and smoking. As to the elimination of the carcinogenic element in tobacco, actually the nicotine and tar con-

tent is increasing according to the latest Consumers Union cigarette analysis as reported in the January 24, 1955, issue of Advertising Age, which tested 37 brands of cigarettes for tar and nicotine content and compared results with a similar test made of 27 brands two years earlier. Twenty of the brands were included in both tests. Two brands of the twenty showed the same nicotine contents in 1955 as in 1953. The remaining 18 brands included in both tests showed an increase in nicotine content.

The nicotine yield from a Camel cigarette was found to have increased from 1.9 to 3.3 milligrams. The regular size Old Golds, Lucky Strikes, Philip Morris and Chesterfields also rose in nicotine, though not as sharply as Camels. Because of a change in method of testing no two year comparisons were made for tar content. The types of tobacco used in cigarettes determines the nicotine content and the Consumers Union found that the best way to lower nicotine content is to use low-nicotine tobacco. Filter brands were found to eliminate only about one third of the tars and also to lower the nicotine content somewhat, though there were several exceptions. King-size non-filter brands were found at the top of the heap in both tar and nicotine content.

Causative Relationship Considered Proved

At the eastern meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, held in New York on December 7, 1954, as reported in the December 13th issue of Advertising Age, Dr. Ernest L. Wynder of the Sloan-Kettering Institute research division of the Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York, and Dr. Leonid S. Snegireff, Harvard Associate Professor of cancer control and cancer control director at New England Deaconess Hospital, Boston, each asserted that there is a definite tie between cigarette smoking and cancer and showed statistical material to support their assertion and upon which their conclusions were based. The statistical material indicated that the upward trend in lung cancer IS related to smoking. Said Dr. Wynder, "Smoking is the primary factor in this great increase in lung cancer. We must consider the causative relationship as proved. "Cigarette smoking," said Dr. Snegireff, "is by far the most serious of the causally related features which people with lung cancer have in common."

E. Cuyler Hammond, summing up a study he made for the American Cancer Society, reported "The most notable finding was that heavy cigarette smokers in (the 50 to 69 age group) have about double the death rate from coronary artery disease as do men who have never smoked.

Other factors contributing to lung cancer were

cited by Dr. W. C. Hueper, Chief of National Cancer Institute's environmental cancer section. He said that several atmospheric pollutants are, to a great extent, responsible for lung cancer.

He cited "dusts and fumes of nickel, chromium compounds, arsenicals, certain cancer-producing petroleum derivatives and radio active gases." He added that "significant amounts of recognized cancer producing chemicals" have been found in exhausts of gasoline and diesel engines, in dust of asphalted roads and in "the carbon black constituting a considerable component of automobile tires."

Lung Cancers From Other Environmental Causes Rare

While there probably are a number of cancer-producing chemicals in the atmosphere about us, yet it is so rare to see a man with cancer of the lung *who is not a smoker* that Dr. Alton Ochsner, Professor of Surgery and Head of the Department of Surgery, Tulane University, Director, Division of General Surgery, Ochsner Clinic, New Orleans; Past President of the American Cancer Society and Past President of the American College of Surgeons says, in dealing with a non-smoking man with lung disease that might be cancer, "I am willing to exclude the diagnosis of cancer even prior to examination, since epidermoid cancer is one produced by a cancer-producing agent."

Since all cancers in men aside from lung cancer have increased only slightly according to Dr. Ochsner, and cancer of the lung is increasing more rapidly than any other type, and since this increase is found only among men who are cigarette smokers, there is only one conclusion left to draw and that is that cigarettes are largely responsible for lung cancer. This is true because cigarette smokers usually inhale, and by this practice the cancer producing substances in tobacco is brought into contact with lining of the bronchial tubes and of the lungs.

Pipe smokers and cigar smokers seldom inhale and are, therefore, less likely to develop cancer of the lung. The pipe smoker is much more likely to develop cancer of the lip and the cigar smoker cancer of the tongue or throat.

Occasionally cancer of the lung occurs in men and women who do not smoke, but almost without exception this is adenocarcinoma, a glandular produced cancer, whereas the cancers cigarette smokers develop are almost without exception epidermoid cancers, caused by a cancer producing agent.

Tobacco Users—Candidates For Cancer

According to the American Cancer Society's report, "every tobacco user, whether he smokes standard cigarettes, a filter cigarette, 'denicotinized' cigarettes, pipes, or cigars, whether he snuffs tobacco or chews tobacco, is a candidate for cancer. And he will remain a candidate as long as he uses to-

bacco in any form."

"If you have been a steady smoker, *even if you have stopped smoking*, it would be wise to have your chest X-rayed immediately for early detection of possible lung cancer in the curable stages. Thereafter, an X-ray every six months for at least three years is strongly advisable."

In this year 1955, "approximately 25,000 Americans will die from lung cancer. In 95 per cent of the cases death will be traceable to smoking." This, from Dr. Ochsner, who performs from three to five cancer operations every week.

Don't be misled and deceived by the claims that while "Smoking is often a health hazard, but evidence that it is a major cause of lung cancer is still inconclusive."—From the conclusion of "Consumer's Report" as quoted in *Advertising Age*, January 24, 1955. That isn't the conclusion of the scientists and surgeons who work in the laboratories and operating rooms of the cancer clinics.

J. R. P.

GAMBLING AND LIQUOR BILLS BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE

At the time of this writing a total of sixteen bills having to do with gambling or liquor have been introduced into the Pennsylvania Legislature all of which call for opposition on the part of Church and reform groups.

Six of these bills were introduced in the Senate and ten in the House of Representatives.

Those in the Senate are—

No. 24—A bingo measure introduced by Senator John J. McCreesh of Philadelphia.

Nos. 41 & 43—Both bingo measures and introduced by Senator John J. Haluska of Patton. Each of these bills are in the Law and Order Committee of which Senator G. Robert Watkins of West Chester is Chairman.

No. 71—A bill having to do with transfer of beer to liquor licenses.

No. 75—A local option bingo bill.

No. 92 A bi-partisan bill calling for a referendum on race track gambling, reported favorably out of committee. Vote to send bill back to committee, defeated 25 to 23. Immediately following the vote the bill was given its second reading. Final reading and vote expected on March 23.

Those in the House are—

No. 4—A race track bill introduced by H. J. Maxwell of Monessen.

No. 29—A race track bill introduced by Francis X. MulDowney of Philadelphia.

No. 44—A bingo bill introduced by Edwin D. Eshleman of Millersville.

No. 76—A bill to liberalize liquor licenses by John J. Vaughan of Pittsburgh.

(Continued on page 5)

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science
Founded in 1867

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

Published Bi-Monthly

January, March, May, July, September and November
at the Association's Headquarters, 209 Ninth St.,

RENWICK H. MARTIN, D.D. }
J. RENWICK PATTERSON, D.D. } Co-Editors

Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

Rates, \$1.00 the year, payable in advance.

"Second class mail privileges authorized at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania."

"ONE IN 20,000"

The above caption is the title of a 30 minute 16-mm motion picture in sound and natural color, a print of which has just been purchased by The National Reform Association. This is a semi-documentary of what happens when Bill Johnson contracts cancer of the lung. The picture is a powerful portrayal of lung cancer, its cause and treatment.

Bill, a former ace reporter for a big city newspaper and now, by choice, a small town editor, visits his local chest X-ray mobile unit. The results of this visit send Bill to visit his local doctor who sends him to glamorous New Orleans, to a famous clinic. There you hear a great chest surgeon tell Bill that he has chest cancer and how it came about. You go with Bill into the operating room where the surgeon performs the operation that alone can save his life. You see the actual operation performed to remove Bill's lung, discolored by tobacco tar and damaged by cancer. Then, as Bill recovers from the operation, you rejoice with him that he is not one of the 20,000 annually who die of lung cancer in the United States.

This is an honest film—one that every American should see. All medical personnel *are* medical personnel playing *themselves*. The doctors are real doctors. The operation is a real operation. The sights and sounds are authentic. Before your very eyes you see the lung, damaged and discolored by tobacco.

This film is unique. Nothing like it has ever been made. In conveying the truth about tobacco and lung cancer, it has no equal.

Having the film and providing the equipment and operator for introducing and showing it, the National Reform is now booking showings in the Pittsburgh vicinity and Western Pennsylvania area. Schools, Service groups, Temperance groups, Bible classes, Young People's groups, Parent Teachers Associations, Churches and other groups will want to see this picture.

Every young person should see it before acquiring the tobacco habit. Every smoker should see it. It may save his life.

We purchased this film because we saw it, experienced its tremendous impact, and felt compelled to participate in introducing it to the American public. We would have been derelict in duty had we failed to do so.

Contact the National Reform Association, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (Phone ATLantic 1-4091) for booking dates.

J. R. P.

FEDERATED LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

On Monday, February 28, Dr. R. H. Martin and Dr. J. R. Patterson drove to Harrisburg in order to be present for a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Federated Legislative Committee which was called to meet Tuesday A. M. for the purpose of considering the need of cancelling the proposed Legislative Field Day set for April 12th or of postponing it to a later and more strategic date. The latter course of action was followed and the date was set for Tuesday, May 10th.

This Legislative Field Day dinner, which will be held in the Zomba Mosque in Harrisburg and at which the Governor and members of both houses are invited (the Legislature usually takes recess for the dinner meeting) affords the Church groups and Reform forces of the Commonwealth a splendid opportunity for making their position known to the members of the legislature, backed up with a demonstration in the form of the presence of a thousand or more people from all over the state who are determined to do everything in their power to prevent the enactment of any legislation that would be detrimental to the moral interests of the Commonwealth.

Considerable time was given to hearing information regarding the moral issue bills that have been introduced to the Legislature and to planning strategy and procedure in dealing with them. A list of these bills will be found elsewhere in this issue.

J. R. P.

LIQUOR SELLERS' LIABILITY

Something new in the way of liability of a liquor seller for what happens to his patrons afterward has been established in Connecticut.

A year ago a young girl was killed in an automobile collision with a machine whose driver had been drinking. Her father sued two establishments which had sold liquor to the driver, charging them with contributory negligence. They have just settled the case by the payment of \$22,000.

This establishes responsibility in a way that is unusually rare. Mostly there is a disclaimer of any liability for what happens to a patron after he has spent his money.

If this precedent from Connecticut is extended, it

is likely to make every taproom owner far more cautious about how much liquor he sells to a patron.

As a measure of law enforcement, this settlement of a damage case may be far more effective than the penalties exacted in our State by the Liquor Control Board, which in many cases amount only to very slight slaps on the wrist.

—*Philadelphia Inquirer*

CREDIT VS. RESPONSIBILITY

One very articulate company within the liquor industry endeavors to claim "credit by association" for numerous wealthy and successful gentlemen who, it implies, drink its product. The company, and others in the same business, must take some responsibility, also, for the men and women whose drunken, reckless, or criminal behavior appears associated with the very same product—liquor.

To emphasize that fact—that credit for one cannot be claimed without bearing, also, responsibility for the other—has been the purpose of our small editorial feature, "Men of Distinction," carried on this page every now and then for the past six years and more.

The liquor industry has been urging the doctrine of moderation — moderation in all things, including drinking. This, of course, betokens a greater sense of responsibility, whether or not imposed by necessity, than did some of the advertising of the past.

By the same reasoning, however, the liquor interests must bear some responsibility when one of its members flouts what the industry has been saying.

We have before us an advertisement from a Florida newspaper placed by a bar and cocktail lounge. It reads as follows:

"All you can drink for only \$2. . . . Just tell one of our glamorous bar maids which 'deal' you want and she'll whip up all you can drink (and they're full measure, too). . . ."

What's that about moderation?

—*Christian Science Monitor*

LEGALIZE GAMBLING?

The lobbyists who never tire of trying to make horse-race gambling legal in Pennsylvania now have thought up a nice, neat sugar-coating for the pill they are trying to sell to the Legislature.

This would be, as reported by Democratic Floor Leader John H. Dent of the State Senate, a referendum feature which would enable Pennsylvania voters to decide whether it should be legal to bet on the bangtails.

"It isn't right under our democratic system for a small group of people, like the Legislature, to sit in Harrisburg and say that we will or will not have race-track betting," Mr. Dent said. We'll agree with Mr. Dent that far. And we'll go

further and say that we have heard no insistent demand by any considerable group of citizens in any part of the state for legalized gambling.

All the talk about legalizing horse-track gambling comes from Harrisburg. It comes from there every time the Legislature sits, and with monotonous regularity the bills are regularly voted down or pickled. There is no indication of any widespread support for them.

* * * *

The pro-gambling clique is fond of spinning large stories about the way Pennsylvanians go to other states to lose their money, and the huge revenues that Pennsylvania can get if it will only keep this "business" at home.

Well, the tax collections of our neighboring states are available in reports of the Tax Foundation, of New York City. Last year West Virginia collected \$1,747,000; Ohio collected \$5,541,000 and Maryland collected \$6,837,000.

New Jersey did better, with \$21,026,000, and New York topped the list with \$48,653,000. But New York has long-established tracks drawing customers from large centers of population. Any state going into that business anew would find stiff competition for the sucker's dollar.

For what money the state might get out of it, we'd pay in many different ways—in broken homes, ruined careers and draining off of buying power. Legalized gambling brings a whole train of misfortunes, along with assorted grafters, pickpockets, touts and an unsavory racket element. The state doesn't need money that badly.

And make no mistake about it. The bill that's being talked up in Harrisburg isn't a horse-racing bill. Horse-racing is perfectly legal in Pennsylvania. It's the gambling that's illegal, and the so-called horse-racing bill is, purely and simply, a bill to legalize gambling.

—*Pittsburgh Press*

GAMBLING AND LIQUOR BILLS

(Continued from page 3)

No. 106—A bill to legalize professional basket ball on Sundays, introduced by MulDowney.

No. 112—A bill to authorize Courts to grant club licenses outside of quota introduced by James L. Gaffney of Easton and Joseph Pacchioli of Bethlehem.

No. 195—A bill authorizing liquor bars and taverns to stay open on Good Friday, Christmas eve and on Christmas.

Letters from Pennsylvanians, addressed to their representatives in the Legislature and to the chairmen and members of the committees to which these bills are referred are imperative if the moral standards that have so long distinguished this Commonwealth are to be maintained.

J. R. P.

THE "PITTSBURGH EXPERIMENT"

PITTSBURGH, March 3—A new "Pittsburgh Experiment," designed to help bring religion into our daily working lives, was formally launched here today.

The program was outlined at a luncheon of the Advisory Board, Trustees, and the newly named director.

The "Pittsburgh Experiment" will be under the supervision of Rev. William H. Cohea, Jr., formerly of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, who has been brought to Pittsburgh to become Executive Director.

The "Pittsburgh Experiment" will be the first of its kind in the country, it was pointed out today. Its success thus far is credited to the lively interest of men and women in Pittsburgh, of all denominations, who wish to know more about how religious knowledge and practice can be applied to everyday life—in the home and on the job.

Pastors of five prominent churches in Downtown Pittsburgh make up the Advisory Board of the new inter-denominational movement.

They are:

Dr. Albert G. Curry, Methodist Church.

Dr. Robert J. Lamont, First Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Edward E. Martz, Smithfield Evangelical Protestant Church (Congregational).

The Very Reverend N. R. H. Moor, Dean of Trinity Cathedral, Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Robert W. Stackel, First Lutheran Church.

Trustees of the "Pittsburgh Experiment" are:

Dr. William E. Hall, First Presbyterian Church.

Paul A. R. Kurtz, Pittsburgh Press staff member, First Lutheran Church.

John A. Lathwood, Trinity Cathedral.

Admiral Ben Moreell, Chairman, J&L Steel Corporation, Calvary Church.

Dr. Samuel M. Shoemaker, Rector, Calvary Church.

George Varnum, Jr., Tomsett Associates, Methodist Church.

William Witte, J. H. Matthews Co., Smithfield Evangelical Protestant Church.

The new Executive Director of the program, Rev. William H. Cohea, Jr., comes to Pittsburgh after having served as Pastor of the Daniels Park Presbyterian Church in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Rev. Cohea attended Northwestern University and was graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1952. He served on the University Mission Team, which traveled to various colleges and universities throughout the country holding informal meetings to discuss religion in everyday life.

"The Pittsburgh Experiment is a new approach to education and the training of present and future business leaders," Rev. Cohea said today. "The movement is designed primarily to reach men and women in industry and business. Through inter-denominational informal meetings and by individual effort, we

hope to show people how faith can play an important role in their personal lives, in their business careers, and in the growth of industry."

The "Pittsburgh Experiment" is the formal organization that is the sequel of an activity stressing religion-in-everyday-life which has been going on informally in the Pittsburgh district for several years. The program has caught the attention of national publications such as Fortune Magazine, the Readers Digest, and others.

Admiral Moreell is Chairman of the Trustees of the "Pittsburgh Experiment."

Dr. R. H. Martin and Dr. J. R. Patterson were privileged to attend the above luncheon as invited guests and were deeply impressed with the objectives of the movement. We shall be following with our interest and prayers its progress.

DIGEST OF RESOLUTIONS REPORT

(Concluded from page 8)

States Senate that would provide scientific tests for intoxication while driving in the District of Columbia. . . .

We commend President Eisenhower for instituting and encouraging a campaign for safe driving . . . we recommend the elimination of all places selling alcoholic beverages from the neighborhood of our main highways, as partial approach to the problem.

FOERIGN POLICY

We recommend that the Secretary of Defense take steps to eliminate the sale of all alcoholic beverages at Armed Services installations, both at home and abroad and that officers who persist in drinking in violation of the announced policy of the administration be appropriately disciplined.

APPRECIATION

We express to the Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church, and to Dr. Caradine R. Hooton, Executive Secretary, our appreciation and thanks for the use of the newly decorated Chapel, as a place of meeting amidst beautiful surroundings and a Christian atmosphere.

We express to Dr. Clinton N. Howard and the International Reform Federation our grateful appreciation of their kind invitation to the 60th observance of the Fellowship Breakfast, held in the Senate Dining Room in the U. S. Capitol Building. . .

We express to the Legislative Committee of the Council our thanks for their alert and untiring labors during the year and to the Committee on Liquor Advertising, and especially to Dr. R. H. Martin and Dr. J. R. Patterson, our thanks for their special work in our behalf.

We express to our president, Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker, and to our secretary, Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, our sincere thanks and appreciation of the courteous, and capable leadership of the sessions of this conference.

WHY NOT DRINK SOCIALLY?

(Continued from page 1)

things are expedient. All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any."

For the "social drinker the above words should be particularly significant. Even though he may be quite certain that he himself possesses enough will power to save himself from becoming a slave of strong drink, let him never lose sight of the fact that, in his own home, in his club, and in the homes of friends, he is constantly setting an example for others, many of whom may be doomed eventually to become alcoholics. And who is to guarantee that he himself is immune? Let it not be forgotten that the hundreds of thousands of pitiable victims of strong drink in America today—both men and women—most certainly began as "social drinkers"—every one of them.

If the "Lutheran Companion" never ceases to dwell on the curse of strong drink, it is because the writer, through many years in the ministry, has had abundant opportunity to observe the devastating trail of misery and woe this enemy of human society has left behind itself everywhere. He has seen how it has wrecked homes, destroyed families, reduced them to abject poverty, deprived little children of the ordinary comforts of life and the security of home and parents, robbed men of their honor and sense of duty, led them to commit unspeakable crimes, destroyed their faith in God, wrecked their minds and bodies, and brought them to early graves.

We know, of course, that there are also gluttons when it comes to eating, but it is quite illogical to compare the man who over-indulges in pecan pie with the man who becomes an addict of strong drink. We have never yet known of a man who squandered his whole pay-check for peacan pies, or who rolled in the gutter afterwards, or who became a crazed driver on the crowded highways, or who beat up his wife and children after he got home—if indeed he reached home—just because he ate a lot of pecan pies. But we know of a lot of men who have done exactly these things because they were slaves of strong drink.

Fortunately, the world at last seems to be coming aware of how serious and sinister the problem really is. We are quite certain that the liquor interests were not a bit happy over that gripping TV portrayal of "The Medic" during Christmas week, telling the grim story of what hospitals have come to expect as the tragic aftermath of Christmas "office parties."

Nor could they have been very happy about the

interview that French Premier Pierre Mendes-France gave over TV just before he left America, when he stated that "alcoholism is the greatest problem confronting my country today." And this from the head of a country where wine is the most important national product, and where, because it is used so commonly as a beverage, the French people were supposed to have become temperate in their habits.

From every part of the world the story is much the same. In this issue of "The Lutheran Companion" are two items that just came to our desk through *Religious News Service*. From Sydney, Australia, came the story of how 1,500 clergymen, led by Dr. William George Hilliard, Bishop Coadjutor of Sydney, marched on parliament house in protest against a proposed liquor law. Said the Bishop: "We are so often called in to clean up the mess when excessive drinking has wrought its evil results in the toll of the road, in broken homes, in ruined characters and in the blighted lives of little children," and he predicted that the proposed law would further corrupt the morals of the community.

Even more surprising was the item that came from far-off East Africa, which told of a resolution adopted by the biennial meeting of the Lutheran Church of Northern Tanganyika, calling on the Church and the territorial government to "take a firm stand against alcoholism." Excessive drinking was condemned as the cause of "violation of home life, desecration of the Sabbath, and ruin of human souls and personalities." The so-called Christian lands have evidently sent their vices to the Dark Continent as well as their missionaries.

And that reminds us of an item we quoted last week from the first issue of *Hemlandet*, published by Dr. T. N. Hasselquist just a hundred years ago, describing two drunken countrymen whom he had encountered stumbling on the streets of Rock Island. "How said," he wrote, "that this spook must follow us to America, consume a man's generous income, banish peace from our families, and prepare the body for an early grave and the soul for an eternal hell."

All of which is a reminder that strong drink is a world-wide problem, and not one confined to our time alone, but one that has plagued human society in all ages. And it may also serve to explain why this church paper will continue to use all the influence it has in fighting relentlessly this cruel and devastating foe of both God and man.

"Whoever first brewed beer has prepared a pest for Germany. I have prayed to God that He would destroy the whole brewing industry. I have often pronounced a curse on the brewer. All Germany could live on the barley that is spoiled and turned into a curse by the brewer."

—Martin Luther

Digest Of The Report Of The Resolutions Committee Of The National Temperance And Prohibition Council

January 27, 1955

We . . . pledge ourselves to the objective of total abstinence for the individual and of the total destruction of the liquor traffic.

ARMED SERVICES

. . . the Members of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council urge Congress to ban alcoholic beverages in all branches of the Armed Forces at home and abroad.

PEACE-TIME UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

. . . We would . . . call upon Congress to refuse to enact any type of peace-time Universal Military Service law.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS

. . . We recommend the passage of both Federal and State statutes which forbid the election or appointment to any public office of anyone who engages in the manufacture, or sale of alcoholic beverages.

ADVERTISING

Whereas the American people, concerned because of the pernicious influence of intoxicating liquor advertising in their homes, have repeatedly through petitions, resolutions and letters expressed their opposition to the networks, the advertisers and to Members of Congress, we now respectfully call upon the Congress of the U. S. to pass legislation to protect the American home by outlawing all alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the air.

Whereas the Supreme Court has declared that no one has an inherent right to manufacture and sell alcoholic beverages for human consumption, it is therefore logical that no one has any inherent right to advertise or promote the sale or consumption of such beverages, since they are permitted only by special privilege, and whereas the home is the primary target of such advertising, and by it the family—both young and old alike—is being indoctrinated with the false idea that “beer belongs” and wine is for the family.”

And whereas radio and television reach not only across County and State lines in our own U. S. where the sale of alcoholic beverages are prohibited but also across international boundaries from the U. S. into Ontario, Canada, where liquor advertising over the radio and television is prohibited thus interfering with the laws of a sister country.

We therefore recommend that all organizations affiliated with the National Temperance and Prohibition Council participate actively and intensively in promoting through their official organs and otherwise, a campaign against liquor advertising, making all possible use of the materials provided by the Council's Committee Against Liquor Advertising.

EDUCATION

(1) We recommend . . . that parents exercise their influence by the example of a life dedicated to Christ and to total abstinence from all that would defile the body which is the temple of God.

(2) We recommend an educational program for total abstinence within our churches. . . .

(3) We recommend the observance of the quarterly temperance instruction in our church schools with special emphasis upon the last Sunday of October as World Temperance Sunday. This should include adequate moral instruction concerning beverage alcohol. . . .

(4) We recommend contact with school officials to acquaint them with sound teaching materials on the subject of alcohol.

(5) We recommend cooperation with teachers in elementary and high schools supplying them with correct teaching materials and proper guide books.

(6) We recommend provision of scholarships for teachers to accredited schools for alcohol education.

We further recommend that we keep constantly before the general public the tremendous contribution which the liquor traffic is making to crime, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, poverty, traffic accidents, and the problems of mental health together with the cost to the state in dealing with these.

LABELING

. . . the Council recommends to the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit that all alcohol beverages be specifically and prominently labeled to show . . . the percentage of alcohol by volume therein contained.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

We commend the principle of the statute recently enacted in New York, which declares that any person who operates a motor vehicle or motorcycle in this state shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his breath, blood, urine, or saliva for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content of his blood, provided that such test is administered at the direction of a police officer having reasonable grounds to suspect such person of driving in an intoxicated condition. If such person refuses to submit to such chemical test, the test shall not be given, but the Commissioner shall revoke his license or permit to drive and any non-resident operating privileges.

We commend those organizations and groups which have cooperated in working for the enactment of such legislation . . . in states and territories which do not have it.

We commend Senator Matthew M. Neely of West Virginia for introducing a bill into the United

(Continued on page 6)